

ADMINISTRATIVE  
INTERNAL USE ONLY

23 JUL 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Training

THROUGH : Chief, Functional Training Division

SUBJECT : Course Report on the [REDACTED] Seminar on Leadership, 22-27 June 1975 STATINTL

1. The pilot running of the [REDACTED] Seminar on Leadership was, overall, a success in the opinion of the participants, and this success is an initial gauge of its training potential for Agency executives in the field of leadership. STATINTL

2. The Seminar was led by [REDACTED] assisted by two of his associates, [REDACTED] and by three psychologists from the Psychological Services Staff of OMS [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] performed under contract for \$18,500 and for an additional \$1,050 provided training for the three PSS/OMS psychologists prior to the pilot running. Besides the instructional staff, three staffers from PSS/OMS-- [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]--attended as observers. [REDACTED] acted as OTR Coordinator during the Seminar. STATINTL

3. There were 39 participants out of 42 nominated by the four Deputy Directors and by the Chairman of the "E" Career Service. Mr. Blake's memorandum of 14 May 1975 requested the nomination of 35 senior officers (GS-15 and above) and 7 junior officers (GS-12 to GS-14), but last-minute changes brought the number down to 39. Of that number, 4 came from the O/DCI; 10, DDA; 8, DDI; 10, DDO; and 7, DDS&T. By GS level, the figures are: 3, GS-18; 1, GS-17; 9, GS-16; 19, GS-15; 6, GS-14; and 1, GS-12. STATINTL

4. Though the Seminar at the [REDACTED] was as close [REDACTED] as circumstances permitted, there were a number of differences. These differences arose out of the setting [REDACTED] the size of the class, the Agency as the source of the participants, security aspects, and the use of Agency psychologists as instructors. STATINTL

ADMINISTRATIVE  
INTERNAL USE ONLY

STATINTL

STATINTL 5. The physical facilities [REDACTED] are more spread  
STATINTL out than the motel facilities used by the Seminar [REDACTED]  
STATINTL These differences did not create serious administrative  
STATINTL problems in the conduct of the transplated Seminar, and with  
STATINTL the cooperation of the staff [REDACTED] the schedule ran smoothly.  
STATINTL [REDACTED] as a place to socialize in the afternoon and evening  
STATINTL was not as well patronized as expected, but then it is a bit  
STATINTL of a walk. The main classroom, Arena A, is a superior  
STATINTL lecture hall, and the suitability of this classroom contributed  
STATINTL in a positive way to the high degree of interaction between  
STATINTL the [REDACTED] staff and the participants. The single-occupancy  
STATINTL [REDACTED] assignments; the use of [REDACTED] as quarters for the in-  
STATINTL structional staff, observers and coordinator; the reserved  
STATINTL area in the dining room; and the two evenings at the [REDACTED]  
STATINTL [REDACTED] contributed to the professionalism of the course.

STATINTL 6. A second difference was the size of the class.  
The Agency version was double the size of the original  
Seminar which is limited to 21 participants. We now know as  
a result of the pilot running that the double-sized class is  
practical. The [REDACTED] staff noticed no dampening effect  
upon its teaching mission and upon the spontaneity of partici-  
pants and staff.

STATINTL 7. A third difference arose because the Agency version  
drew its participants from one organization in the govern-  
ment, not a number of different organizations in business  
and government. Coming from different organizations, the  
participants [REDACTED] are strangers to each other, and  
this feature contributes to the effectiveness of the small  
group discussions. The belief is that strangers can have  
frank discussions that working associates might find too  
threatening. By drawing from one agency, and a not so large  
one at that, the expectation was that the Seminar would not  
be composed of strangers. Contrary to this expectation, the  
participants in the Agency version tended to be strangers to  
each other, and to this extent, the small group members  
STATINTL tended to be strangers just as in [REDACTED] version. I  
conducted an informal poll of my classmates and found that  
the typical participant knew only four to five participants  
prior to the course. A few knew up to 10 beforehand. On  
STATINTL this basis, the small groups tended to be composed of strangers.  
There was an exception. [REDACTED] was familiar with all but  
one member of his small group composed of 3 GS-18s, 1 GS-17,  
and 2 GS-16s. Though this group was not composed of strangers,  
it appears to have functioned as well, if not better, than

ADMINISTRATIVE  
INTERNAL USE ONLY

ADMINISTRATIVE

Approved For Release 2001/07/16 : CIA-RDP79-00498A000700080004-2

STATINTL the other groups. The high GS levels were concentrated in one unit because the groups had been stratified by grade ranging from the highest GS levels in Group A down to the lowest GS levels in Group F. The groups were organized by grade for two reasons. One reason was the known preference [REDACTED] for homogeneous rather than random groups. The second reason was the belief that because management problems vary roughly according to GS level, homogeneous groups would find more in common to discuss. Though some of the participants would have preferred more disparate groups, the rationale for homogeneous groups did meet with grudging acceptance in the class.

8. Security problems led to the fourth category of differences. One problem was the concern of some participants over the security aspects of their case studies, especially when the group leader was an outsider. Once the course got under way, this worry seemed to evaporate. Another security problem did cause difficulties. To meet the concern of the DDO over the cover problems of its nominees, it was agreed that first names and last initials only would be used in the course, at least for rosters, name tags and name plates. Unfortunately, this solution was not really acceptable to the class. Some in the class felt frustrated because of the difficulty in finding out who's who.

STATINTL 9. A fifth difference was that three of the small groups were led by Agency psychologists, not [REDACTED] instructors. Some of the participants felt deprived in that they did not have the experience of being in a group led by the outsiders. As a solution, some proposed that in one way or another, the [REDACTED] staff be shared by all groups.

STATINTL 10. With these differences in mind, one can see that evaluations of the Seminar should be looked at in two ways: those evaluations that refer to the Seminar itself and those that refer to modifications unique to the running of the Agency version.

STATINTL 11. The evaluations clearly indicate a favorable and positive judgment on the Seminar itself. The participants were impressed with the [REDACTED] staff, the content of the course, and the way the course was conducted. According to opinions expressed in the classroom, the participants feel the Seminar would best serve senior officers at the division chief level and above. The evaluations also express a certain tentativeness of judgment about the practical value of

ADMINISTRATIVE

INTERNAL USE ONLY

ADMINISTRATIVE  
INTERNAL USE ONLY

the Seminar. This tentativeness is not directed at the Seminar but expresses an element of wait-and-see as to the applicability of the psychoanalytic theory to the leadership problems of the participants. Everybody recognized that more had been presented than could be absorbed in a 6-day course, and the class appears to agree [REDACTED] that it will take some time to develop the implications of the theory for the job and the organization.

STATINTL

12. Also, the evaluations indicate that many individuals learned something new in the Seminar. The psychological contract caught the attention and interest of a number of participants. The idea that the mutual expectations of employee and employer run deeper than the obvious elements, such as salary and working conditions, stimulated discussion and thought. Another concept, the idea that all change, good and bad, involves stress and that this stress must be recognized and handled, spoke to the experience of many in the class. There was concern as to the best way to handle the effects of stress in the job situation.

13. A number of participants noted that the Seminar is geared for business organizations, and they recommended that the exercises utilizing business cases be modified to include cases drawn from the experience of the Federal Government and the Agency. There was a suggestion that an Agency briefing before the Seminar would have been helpful to the [REDACTED] staff.

STATINTL

14. In addition to criticism directed at the Seminar itself, there were criticisms leveled at the Seminar as modified for the Agency. The first name and last initial technique did frustrate the class, and a new solution to this cover problem should be sought. A spate of criticism focused on the small groups and their activities. It may be that the homogeneity of the groups can be reconsidered in terms of lessening the spread of GS levels in the class. It may be that there is a way to share the [REDACTED] instructors among all the groups. It may be that the helper-seeker exercise can be strengthened. It is likely that the Agency instructors will improve with practice.

STATINTL

15. Taken overall, the comments about the small groups and their activities seem to say that here lies a weakness of the Seminar, and it may be that the criticism is as much directed at the content of the small group sessions as at

ADMINISTRATIVE  
INTERNAL USE ONLY

ADMINISTRATIVE

STATINTL

the Agency psychologists. The symptom that stands out is that the [REDACTED] instructors were rated as more successful than the Agency instructors. It is not clear, however, that improved performance of the Agency instructors would do other than mask a relative weakness in content.

16. There appears to be two conclusions that can be drawn from the pilot run. The first is that the Seminar is a successful teaching vehicle and that with some adjustments it will continue to be successful. The second is that the participants are impressed with the potential value of the psychoanalytic theory for themselves and the organization, but they have not yet reached the conclusion that this potential can actually be transformed into improved performance on the job. It will take time, opinion surveys and, perhaps, more pilots to settle this point.

STATINTL

[REDACTED]  
OTR Coordinator

Atts:

- A - Roster
- B - Schedule
- C - Class Profile
- D - Student Evaluations

ADMINISTRATIVE  
INTERNAL USE ONLY

# ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

(224)

SUBJECT: (Optional) **STATINTL**  
Course Report: **STATINTL** Seminar on Leadership

FROM: <b>STATINTL</b> Chief Instructor		EXTENSION 2826	NO. DATE 24 July 1975
TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)	DATE		OFFICER'S INITIALS
	RECEIVED	FORWARDED	
1. C/MATB	24 July	CL	<p>2-6: Since you may want to pass a copy of this to the DDA, we have given a copy to CMS/PSS. As you know, they are preparing their own report. Presumably they will give us a copy</p> <p>Jack:</p> <p>The basic student reaction to the <b>STATINTL</b> Seminar is essentially positive. There are, however, the usual questions to a training exposure, i.e.:</p> <p>a. Is the substantive content, or lesson, applicable to the job-- that is, is the new knowledge practically useful?</p> <p>b. Has a change in the behavior of the student been effected?</p> <p>Questions we must ask are:</p> <p>a. Do we continue with <b>STATINTL</b> at 18,000 a crack?</p> <p>b. Is it possible, or feasible, to bring the package completely in-house?</p> <p>c. For whom in the Agency is this Seminar most indicated and how many people are we talking</p>
2. C/FTD	25 July	W	
3. C/TSS	28 July 75	CL	
4. C/PRS	28 July	JR	
5. DDTR			
6. DTR	30 JUL 1975	AR/MS	
7. DDA			
8. C/MATB - 936 C of C			
9.			
10. Instructor			
11.			
12.			
13.			
14.			
15.			

d Does this Seminar properly  
cap the pyramid of the management  
training curriculum?

STATINTL

Once OMS- [REDACTED] shop--  
has submitted its report and eval-  
uation, I will provide you with  
OTR's recommendations on the  
future use of the [REDACTED] Seminar.

STATINTL

Rod

ILLEGIB

